



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/733,433

12/08/2000

Robert E. Haines

10003220-1

2696

7590

07/06/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

GHEE, ASHANTI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,433

Applicant(s)

HAINES ET AL.

Examiner

Ashanti Ghee

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 13-15, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayward et al. (US Patent No. 6,629,134).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Hayward discloses a method of scheduling an event with respect to a hard copy output engine, comprising: detecting (detect) a first status (the state of the machine) of a first portion (e.g. paper tray empty) of the hard copy output engine (inherent that the peripheral 10 has a hard copy output engine) from a first sensor (sensors 12) incorporated (includes) in the hard copy output engine (10; col. 2, lines 8-16); detecting (detect) a second status (the state of the machine) of a second portion (inherent that to detect conditions e.g. paper tray empty can have another different condition) of the hard copy output engine (10) from a second sensor (sensors 12) incorporated (includes) in the hard copy output engine (10; col. 2, lines 8-16); composing (launches reads on composing) an electronic message (e-mail module) including the detected first and second status (detect conditions, col. 2, lines 8-16; col.

8, lines 17-23); and transmitting (to send) the electronic message (e-mail; col. 8, lines 17-23).

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Hayward discloses the method wherein detecting a first or second status includes detecting a future need for preventative maintenance (col. 7, lines 48-65).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Hayward discloses the method wherein the hard copy output engine is chosen from a group consisting of: facsimile machines, photocopiers and printers (see Fig. 3).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Hayward discloses the method wherein transmitting the electronic message comprises transmitting an electronic message including a consumable order (col. 8, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 15, Hayward discloses a computer implemented control system for a hard copy output engine, the system comprising: a first sensor (sensors 12) coupled (see Fig. 1) to a first portion (conditions e.g. paper tray empty) of the hard copy output engine (inherent that the peripheral 10 has a hard copy output engine), the first sensor (12) being configured (to detect) to provide a first status (the state of the machine) of the first portion (e.g. paper tray empty; col. 2, lines 8-16); a second sensor (sensors 12) coupled (see Fig. 1) to a second portion (inherent that to detect conditions e.g. paper tray empty can have another different condition) of the hard copy output engine (10), the second sensor (12) being configured (to detect) to provide a second status (the state of the machine) of the second portion (col. 2, lines 8-16); and processing circuitry (firmware 16) coupled (see Fig. 1) to the first and second sensors

(sensors 12) and configured to: detect the first status (detect conditions, col. 2, lines 8-16); detect the second status (detect conditions, col. 2, lines 8-16); compose (launches reads on composing) an electronic message (e-mail module) including the detected first and second status (detect conditions, col. 2, lines 8-16; col. 8, lines 17-23); and transmit (to send) the electronic message (e-mail; col. 8, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 17, Hayward discloses the computer implemented control system, wherein the processor is configured to detect a first or second status includes a processor configured to detect a future need for preventative maintenance (col. 7, lines 48-65).

Regarding claim 20, Hayward discloses the computer implemented control system, wherein the processor configured to detect a first and second status comprises a processor configured to detect a first and second status of a hard copy output engine chosen from a group consisting of: facsimile machines, photocopiers and printers (see Fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US Patent No. 6,629,134) in view of Haines et al. (US Patent No. 6,233,409).

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Hayward does not disclose wherein detecting a first or second status includes detecting a toner low or toner out status.

However, Haines discloses the method wherein detecting a first or second status includes detecting a toner low or toner out status (col. 7, lines 39-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayward and Haines due to both references disclosing a consumable ordering system to enhance the ease and speed with which consumables are replenished and/or replaced so that adequate supplies of consumables are available for a computer peripheral device.

Regarding claim 16, Hayward does not disclose wherein the processor configured to detect the first and second status includes a processor configured to detect a toner low or toner out status.

However, Haines discloses the computer implemented control system, wherein the processor configured to detect the first and second status includes a processor configured to detect a toner low or toner out status (col. 7, lines 39-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayward and Haines due to both references disclosing a consumable ordering system to enhance the ease and

speed with which consumables are replenished and/or replaced so that adequate supplies of consumables are available for a computer peripheral device.

3. Claims 4-5, 11-12, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US Patent No. 6,629,134) in view of Haines et al. (US Patent No. 6,529,692) further in view of Sekizawa (US Patent No. 6,681,349).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Hayward and Haines do not disclose wherein composing an electronic message includes composing the electronic message to include information chosen from a list consisting of: percentage of remaining consumable, to whom assigned, blind carbon copy to, copy to, company addressed to, expected completion date, defer until, due date, duration, event address, expiration date, follow-up flag, importance, owner, priority, return receipt request status, remind beforehand, reminder, reminder override default, required attendee list, resources, sensitivity, date sent, start date, addressee, tracking status, consumables order list, maintenance items, malfunction and preventative maintenance items.

However, Sekizawa discloses the method wherein composing an electronic message includes composing the electronic message to include information chosen from a list consisting of: percentage of remaining consumable, to whom assigned, blind carbon copy to, copy to, company addressed to, expected completion date, defer until, due date, duration, event address, expiration date, follow-up flag, importance, owner, priority, return receipt request status, remind beforehand, reminder, reminder override default, required attendee list, resources, sensitivity, date sent, start date, addressee,

tracking status, consumables order list, maintenance items, malfunction and preventative maintenance items (col. 30, lines 26-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayward, Haines, and Sekizawa due to all references disclosing a monitoring system to provide a configuration at low costs for eliminating the need for a communication system from each machine to be monitored.

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Hayward and Haines do not disclose wherein detecting a first and second status includes detecting a first and second status from a list of status items consisting of: toner out, toner low, preventative maintenance alerts, including cleaning or replacement of component parts, consumable orders and low "out of" status for other consumables or need for other maintenance items.

However, Sekizawa discloses the method, wherein detecting a first and second status includes detecting a first and second status from a list of status items consisting of: toner out, toner low, preventative maintenance alerts, including cleaning or replacement of component parts, consumable orders and low "out of" status for other consumables or need for other maintenance items (col. 41, lines 8-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayward, Haines, and Sekizawa due to all references disclosing a monitoring system to provide a configuration at low costs for eliminating the need for a communication system from each machine to be monitored.

Regarding claim 18, Hayward and Haines do not disclose the computer implemented control system, wherein composing an electronic message includes composing the electronic message to include information chosen from a list consisting of: percentage of remaining consumable, to whom assigned, blind carbon copy to, copy to, company addressed to, expected completion date, defer until, due date, duration, event address, expiration date, follow-up flag, importance, owner, priority, return receipt request status, remind beforehand, reminder, reminder override default, required attendee list, resources, sensitivity, date sent, start date, addressee, tracking status, consumables order list, maintenance items, malfunction and preventative maintenance items.

However, Sekizawa discloses wherein composing an electronic message includes composing the electronic message to include information chosen from a list consisting of: percentage of remaining consumable, to whom assigned, blind carbon copy to, copy to, company addressed to, expected completion date, defer until, due date, duration, event address, expiration date, follow-up flag, importance, owner, priority, return receipt request status, remind beforehand, reminder, reminder override default, required attendee list, resources, sensitivity, date sent, start date, addressee, tracking status, consumables order list, maintenance items, malfunction and preventative maintenance items (col. 30, lines 26-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayward, Haines, and Sekizawa due to all references disclosing a monitoring system to provide a

configuration at low costs for eliminating the need for a communication system from each machine to be monitored.

Regarding claim 19, Hayward and Haines do not disclose wherein the processor configured to detect a first and second status includes a processor configured to detect a first and second status from a list of status items consisting of: toner out, toner low, preventative maintenance alerts, including cleaning or replacement of component parts, consumable orders and low "out of" status for other consumables or need for other maintenance items.

However, Sekizawa discloses the computer implemented control system, wherein the processor configured to detect a first and second status includes a processor configured to detect a first and second status from a list of status items consisting of: toner out, toner low, preventative maintenance alerts, including cleaning or replacement of component parts, consumable orders and low "out of" status for other consumables or need for other maintenance items (col. 41, lines 8-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayward, Haines, and Sekizawa due to all references disclosing a monitoring system to provide a configuration at low costs for eliminating the need for a communication system from each machine to be monitored.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2626

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 4, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 4, 11, and 18 contain the terminology "consisting of," according to MPEP 2111.03, defined as "closing the claim to the inclusion of materials other than those recited except for impurities ordinarily associated therewith." The specification fails to include the list of information that was particularly declared in claims 4, 11, and 18.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Walker (US Patent No. 6,302,527) discloses a method and apparatus for transferring information between a printer portion and a replaceable printing component.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashanti Ghee whose telephone number is (703) 306-3443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and alt. Fri. (7-4PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (703) 305-4863. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AG
June 24, 2004

Ashanti Ghee
Examiner
Art Unit 2626



MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER